

REMARKS

Applicants amend the specification as indicated in the foregoing listing of amendments to the specification in order to correct typographical errors. Applicants also amend Figure 2 to correct a typographical error. No new matter is introduced by these amendments.

Initially, claims 1–28 were presented for examination. Applicants cancel claims 1–28 and add new claims 29–48. Upon entry of this paper, claims 29–48 will be pending and under consideration. Support for the new claims can be found at least in the originally filed claims, at page 13, line 25 to page 14, line 21, and in Figure 3.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1–28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,078,892 to Anderson et al. (“Anderson”). Applicants have cancelled claims 1–28, rendering the rejection moot. However, Applicants below address the substance of the rejection with respect to new claims 29–48 that are currently under consideration.

The Anderson patent is generic in that it only discloses retrieving records from a database based on relationships between the records and an item of interest. More specifically, the patent discloses the retrieval of a set of client records from a database by searching the database using client selection criteria related to certain customer traits.

Applicants have presented new claims that strongly distinguish the current invention from Anderson. For example, independent claim 29 recites:

“...tracking and reporting an advancement of the at least one customer lead through the lead processing system.”

In a similar vein, independent claim 39 recites:

“...a tracking and notification module for tracking the at least one customer lead through the lead management system and reporting a status of the lead to at least one of the users.”

Anderson does not teach or suggest tracking a customer lead and reporting or notifying the user about the advancement of the lead through the stages of developing and closing a lead. Rather, Anderson teaches a method and system for retrieving and ranking database records according to user-selected criteria. There is no indication that Anderson contemplates any steps that go beyond the presentation of ranked retrieval results to the user.

Accordingly, since the cited art does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 29 and 39, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 29 and 39, and their dependents, claims 30–38 and 40–48, are patentable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION


In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 29–48 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicants’ attorney would expedite the allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 11, 2004
Reg. No. 33,497

Tel. No.: (617) 310-8108
Fax No.: (617) 248-7100

3138716



Steven J. Frank
Attorney for Applicants
Testa, Hurwitz, & Thibault, LLP
High Street Tower
125 High Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

Amendments to the Drawings:

Applicants amend Figure 2 to correct a typographical error. Applicants submit herewith replacement drawing sheet 2 and marked up drawing sheet 2 reflecting this amendment.

